

REMARKS

The Examiner in the Official Action has rejected claims 1, 2, 3, 6, 7, 11, 18, 19 and 28 under 35 USC § 102(e) as being anticipated by Abe et al. (US patent 6,499,822), for the reasons set forth in paragraph 5. Applicants respectfully submits that the Abe et al. reference is totally apart and distinct from the present invention and does not anticipate, teach or suggest the invention as taught and claimed by applicants. In particular, claims 1 and 7 are directed to a digital print and method of making a print on which an image is provided on a media by a printer. Thereafter, a coordinate system is placed on the media over the image that is not visible to the human eye under normal viewing conditions, the coordinate system is capable of locating a specific area of the image on the print. Additional information is printed on the print that provides information with respect to the content of the image at the specified area.

The Abe et al. reference is directed to providing print on fabric wherein a pre-printed invisible grid is provided. The invisible grid is detected and the printing on the fabric is adjusted for distortion in the fabric.

The first distinction of the present invention with respect to Abe et al. reference, is that in the present invention, the printing of the grid occurs after the printing of the image. This is in complete opposition to Abe et al. In Abe et al. where the grid must be printed first as this is used for locating of the image on the fabric. In the present invention, the grid is provided over the image as opposed to the image being printed over the grid. Thus, Abe et al. teaches away from the present invention. Furthermore, the grid of the present invention is provided for locating a specific area of the image. Whereas the grid on the fabric in Abe et al. is used for determining where the printing occurs on the fabric. Since the image is printed over the grid there is no means in Abe et al. for locating specific for locating a specific area of the print as taught and claimed by applicants.

Another distinguishing feature of the invention as set forth in independent claims 1 and 7 is that the additional data that is printed on the media provides information with respect to the content or the image at the specific areas. The reference by the Examiner providing additional information at column 15, lines 35-41 does not teach or suggest to provide that information with regard to

the image. The barcode in the in the Abe et al reference provides a positional reference to the location of the coordinate system, not the content of the image as claimed by applicants. It provides information with regard to the location of the grid. The Abe et al. reference is directed to totally different art wherein the coordinate system is used for totally different purposes. Thus, it could not anticipate, teach or suggest the invention.

Claims 18, 19, 20 and 28 have been cancelled and are therefore the rejection with regard to these claims are no longer applicable.

The Examiner has also rejected claims 9 and 10 under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Abe et al. in view of Nelson et al. for the reasons set forth in paragraph 7. Claims 9 and 10 depend at least ultimately upon independent claims 7 and therefore are patentably distinct for the same reason. The Nelson et al. reference does not add anything which would render independent claim 7 obvious.

The Examiner also rejected claim 20 under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable for the reasons set forth in paragraph 8 of the Official Action. This objection is no longer applicable as this claim has been cancelled.

The Examiner has also rejected claims 1, 2, 3, 6, 7, 9, 10, and 11 under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nelson et al. (US 6,132,024) in view of Hakamatsuka et al. (US 5,410,642) for the reasons set forth in paragraph 10. As applicants have previously discussed, the Nelson et al. reference is directed to providing an indicia which is typically not visible by machine or sensor for in calibration of a printing device. In particular, Nelson et al. discloses providing indicia for registration of the image component on the media. Nelson et al. merely teaches the providing of marks for locating of printing on the paper. This is in contrast to the present invention where additional data is provided on a media that relates to a specific area and provides information regarding the image content at this area. Since the Nelson et al. reference is directed to merely to the registration of the printing process, it could not teach or suggest providing the coordinating system for designating the area on the image and for providing additional information that relates to that specific area. Accordingly, applicants respectfully submits that the Nelson et al. reference is of little relevance to the present invention.

With regard to the Hakamatsuka et al. reference, this reference is directed to an ID card wherein a particular location is always identified with respect to the card. This is in contrast to the present invention where a grid is printed on the media and the media can have a variety of different type grids. In the Hakamatsuka et al. reference it is always required to have the same location for the same location at all times. In the present invention, the information can be provided at any particular location wherein the grid is used to identify that particular location.

The Nelson et al. and the Hakamatsuka et al. references are directed to two distinct fields. The Nelson et al. is directed to printing and using registration marks whereas the Hakamatsuka et al. is directed to printing ID cards and providing information at a particular location on the ID card. There is no teaching or suggestion or motivation that would suggest the combining of one with the other. Applicants respectfully submits the combining of these references would be based on hindsight and not on any teaching or suggestion in the prior art.

In view of the foregoing applicant respectfully submits that the application is in condition for allowance and such action is respectfully requested.

Attached hereto is a marked-up version of the changes made to the specification and claims by the current amendment. The attached page(s) is captioned "**Version with Markings to Show Changes Made**".

Respectfully submitted,



Frank Pincelli
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 27,370

Frank Pincelli/djw
Rochester, NY 14650
Telephone: (716) 588-2728
Facsimile: (716) 477-4646

Version With Markings to Show Changes Made

In the Specification:

The paragraphs beginning on page 4, lines 5-21 have been deleted.

In the Claims:

Claims 18, 19, 20 and 28 have been cancelled.

-End of document-